

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are pending for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to remove occurrences of the word "with." Claims 1 and 6-9 have been amended to change the phrase "the tubular buffer" to "the at least one tubular buffer."

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

In response to the Examiner's statement that the previously filed IDS documents did not comply with all the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.98, an Information Disclosure Statement fully complying with said section is filed herewith.

### ***Amendments to the Specification***

In response to the Examiner's observation that reference characters "8" and "9" have both been used to designate "outer sheath," the specification has been amended to clarify that "9" is the outer sheath. The specification has also been amended to associate the reference character "3" with the term "well-known waterproof jelly." See Drawing Objections, below. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

### ***Drawing Objections under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84***

As noted above, in response to the Examiner's observation that reference characters "8" and "9" have both been used to designate "outer sheath," the specification has been amended to clarify that "9" is the outer sheath, and in response to the Examiner's objection to the use of a reference character "3" not mentioned in the specification, the specification has been amended to clarify that the reference character "3" refers to the "well-known waterproof jelly" disclosed in the specification. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 4, and 7-9 were objected to because of various informalities. Claim 4 has been cancelled. All instances of the word "with" have been deleted from claims 1 and 7. In claims 1 and 6-9, the term "the tubular buffer" has been changed to "the at least one tubular buffer."

### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gravely (US 5,642,452) in view of Keller (US 6,167,180).

Claim 1 recites:

1. An ADSS (All-Dielectric Self-Supporting) optical cable comprising:

a central tensile member extended in a longitudinal direction;

at least one optical fiber for transmitting an optical signal;

at least one tubular buffer receiving the at least one optical fiber therein and arranged around the central tensile member adjacently, the at least one tubular buffer being twisted on the center of the central tensile member;

an inner sheath extended in the longitudinal direction surrounding the at least one tubular buffer;

an outer tensile member extended in the longitudinal direction surrounding the inner sheath; and

an outer sheath extended in the longitudinal direction surrounding the outer tensile member;

wherein the outer tensile member includes:

a plurality of tensile wires extended in the longitudinal direction in parallel without intentional twisting on the central tensile member; and

*an adhesive resin for connecting the tensile wires adjacent to each other.*

(Emphasis added)

While Gravely discloses an optical cable having a plurality of aramid or glass strength members disposed between the core and jacket of the cable (col. 3 28-33), nothing in Gravely discloses or suggests what claim 1 claims, namely “an adhesive resin for connecting the tensile wires adjacent to each other.”

Keller does teach the use of adhesive and non-adhesive yarns in a layer of flexible strength members (col. 3 16-35). However, Keller does not teach or suggest connecting adjacent tensile wires with adhesive resin. In fact, Keller teaches away from such an arrangement by widely spacing the adhesive yarns and placing non-adhesive yarns between them. This is because the adhesive yarns of Keller adhesively connect the buffer tube to the outer protective jacket, rather than connecting adjacent wires to each other.

Because neither Gravely nor Keller, alone or in combination, teach or suggest what claim 1 claims, claim 1 is patentable over these references or their combination. Because claims 5, 7, and 9 are dependent claims depending from claim 1, they are also

patentable, for at least this reason. Therefore, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed claims 1-3 and claims 5-9 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner not agree with any of Applicant's positions or arguments herein, a telephonic or personal interview is respectfully requested to discuss and resolve any remaining issues.

A fee of \$120 for a one-month extension is believed due for this submission. Please charge the extension fee and any other fee that may be due to Jones Day Deposit Account No. 50-1013.

Date: October 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



By Lawrence R. Gabuzda (Reg. No. 51,711)

For Brian M. Rothery (Reg. No. 35,340)

**JONES DAY**

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(212) 326-3939